References

Jessop, L. 1986. *Dung beetles and chafers. Coleoptera: Scarabaeoidea.* Handbooks for the Identification of British Insects Vol. 5 part 11.

Kuhne, R. 1995. Data to the biology of selected Geotrupes species—*G. spiniger* Marsham, *G. vernalis* Linne and *G. stercorosus* Sciba (Coleoptera, Scarabeaidae, Geotrupini). *Deutsche Entomologische Zeitschrift* **42**: 343–367.

Shirt, D. B. 1991. Scarabaeoidea. In: Cooter, J. *et al.* (Eds). *A coleopterist's handbook.* Amateur Entomologists' Society, Feltham, pp. 97–102.

Editorial note.—That scarabaeids sometimes occur under bark is borne out by my own observations. On 27.xii.1984, I found a specimen of *Trox scaber* (L.) together with several specimens of *Aphodius sphacelatus* (Panz.) and *A. granarius* (L.) under the wet fungoid bark of a large dead standing oak between Lurgashall and Petworth, West Sussex. RICHARD A. JONES.

Nomenclatural changes to some British Tortricidae (Microlepidoptera).—In the recently published *Checklist of the Lepidoptera of Australia* (Nielsen *et al.*, 1996) the genus *Piercea* Filipjev, 1940, is newly synonymized with *Gynnidomorpha* Turner, 1916. The generic combinations of five British species are affected in consequence, and these are listed below together with their code numbers as given in the most recent list of British Lepidoptera (Emmet, 1992).

927 *Gynnidomorpha minimana* (Caradja)
928 *G. permixtana* ([D. & S.])
929 *G. vectisana* (H. & W.)
930 *G. alismana* (Rag.)
931 *G. luridana* (Gregs.)

It should also be noted that Falkovitsh (1962) published a new monobasic genus *Piniphila* with type-species *Tortrix (Sericoris) decrepitana* H.-S., 1851, which is, however, a junior synonym of *Tortrix bifasciana* Haworth, 1811. Bradley *et al.* (1979) apparently overlooked Falkovitsh's publication and included *bifasciana* in the "dustbin" genus *Olethreutes*, and this treatment was followed by Emmet (1992). However, Razowski (1983) treated *Piniphila* as a good genus (and included *bifasciana* as a senior synonym of *decrepitana*) and gave morphological characters distinguishing it from *Olethreutes*. The entry for *bifasciana* in Emmet (1992) should therefore be amended as below.

1079 *Piniphila bifasciana* (Haw.)

K. R. TUCK, Entomology Department, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD.

References

Bradley, J. D., Tremewan, W. G. & Smith, A. 1979. *British tortricoid moths.* Tortricidae: *Olethreutinae.* Ray Society, London, pp. i–viii, 1–336.

Emmet, A. M. 1992. Chapter 3: Chart showing the life history and habits of the British Lepidoptera. In: Emmet, A. M. & Heath, J. (Eds) *The moths and butterflies of Great Britain and Ireland.* Harley Books, Colchester, Vol. 7, Part 2, pp. 61–301.

Falkovitsh, M. I. 1962. New Palaearctic genera of the tribus Olethreutini (Lepidoptera, Tortricidae). *Ent. Obozr.* **41**: 190–197 [In Russian].

Nielsen, E. S., Edwards, E. D. & Rangsi, T. V. (Eds) 1996. Checklist of the Lepidoptera of Australia. *Monogr. Austr. Lepid.* **4**: i–xiii, 1–529.

Razowski, J. 1983. Motyle (Lepidoptera) Polski. Cz. VI—Olethreutinae: Olethreutidii. *Monogr. Fauny Polski* **13**: 1–177 [In Polish].

A tale of two galls.—Galls are distinctive and abnormal growths produced by a plant in response to the influence of an organism (Redfern & Askew, 1992). Frequently, galls are lush outgrowths and have the appearance of being potentially attractive food for other species. I have previously shown that some free-living psyllids and aphids can have faster growth rates when feeding on buckthorn (*Rhamnus catharticus* L.) leaves with galls formed by *Trichochermes walkeri* Förster, and that these different Homoptera show associations ranging from obligate use of galled leaves, through showing a preference for feeding on galled leaves, to showing no significant association with *T. walkeri* galls (McLean, 1994).

Although such feeding on galled leaves by sap-sucking Homoptera may have some negative effects on a gall-former such as *T. walkeri* (though this has yet to be tested for this species), eating gall tissue, and/or eating the gall-inducing organism within the gall, is obviously more directly damaging to the gall-former. I have recently observed two instances of interactions between galls and free-living species which offer contrasting outcomes for the respective gall-formers.

First, I have seen a grey squirrel, *Sciurus carolinensis* Gmelin, feeding on the contents of leaf-petiole galls formed by the aphid *Pemphigus spirothecae* Passerini (Homoptera: Pemphigidae) on Lombardy poplar *Populus nigra* L. var. *italica* at the rear of Monkstone House, City Road, Peterborough at around 19.30 BST on 15 August and again at about 18.30 BST on 20 August 1996. The debris of broken galls and discarded leaves rained down at the rate of several per minute, but whether it was the honeydew, the insects themselves, or these items together which were the principal attraction for the squirrel (or squirrels, as I could not tell whether the same individual was responsible on both dates) remains a mystery. However, examination of the opened galls suggested that it was the gall contents rather than the galls themselves which were consumed by the squirrel(s), which had perhaps acquired a sweet tooth!

Second, in my garden at Miller Way there is a female sallow bush, *Salix ?aurita* L. on which I noticed an inflorescence gall, possibly formed by the mite *Phytopus triradiatus* (Nalepa) (Acari: Eriophyidae) according to the figures in Redfern & Askew (1992) and Stubbs (1986), though the overall form of the gall was more compact. On 20 August 1996 I saw that a substantial number of higher branches on the bush had been defoliated by the clutch-feeding larvae of the buff-tip, *Phalera bucephala* L. (Lepidoptera: Notodontidae). The branch with the single inflorescence gall was completely defoliated around the gall, but the gall itself was intact. Whether these voracious larvae ignored the gall because of its non-leaf shape and texture, and/or whether some chemical(s) deterred feeding is unknown. Clearly, there would be a strong selective advantage favouring those galls which are distasteful to chewing insects such as Lepidoptera larvae (not to mention other browsers, including mammals) but whether many galls are unpalatable seems unclear, and is worth further observation and experiment.—IAN F. G. MCLEAN, 109 Miller Way, Brampton, Huntingdon, Cambs PE18 8TZ.

REFERENCES

McLean, I. F. G. 1994. Interactions between *Trichochermes walkeri* (Homoptera: Psylloidea) and other Homoptera on *Rhamnus catharticus*. In: Williams, M. A. J. (Ed.), *Plant galls*. Systematics Association Special Volume No. 49, Clarendon Press, Oxford, pp. 151–160.